

# America's

# FUTURE

A Weekly Review of News, Books and Public Affairs

Volume 2

July 22, 1960

Number 30

The Big Threat . . . . .	1
The Egg and Taxes . . . . .	2
\$21 for a \$.25 Item . . . . .	4
Let the Reader Beware . . . . .	5
In the Name of "Defense" . . . . .	6
Utterly Fantastic . . . . .	7

## THE BIG THREAT

If we can turn our attention from the political fireworks in Los Angeles and Chicago for a moment, it might be well to remember that Congress is coming back to Washington next month. The politicians are bent on politicking - which means attempts by members of both parties at more handouts and giveaways. So this is a good time to take a look at the solvency of the American government.

The national government wound up its fiscal year a few weeks ago. It had a small

surplus. That is, it spent a little less than it took in. For the current year (which ends next June 30th) the President figures on a larger surplus - around four billion dollars. However, in the past, these predictions of a surplus have usually turned out to be too optimistic. And the President himself has said that Congress could quickly turn the hoped-for surplus into a whopping big deficit if it votes all the spending it has in mind.

However, fantastic as these

annual figures are - tax grabs and spending of around 80 billion dollars a year - they are peanuts compared to the national debt which is hanging over our heads. Nobody except a few brave souls wants to talk about the debt. But ignoring it will not make it go away. It has to be dealt with - the sooner the better, before it deals us all a death blow.

The current debt is supposed to be around 290 billion dollars. But Maurice Stans, the Director of the Budget, says we are kidding ourselves. We are not including a tremendous batch of future payments for which we have obligated ourselves, plus another batch of C.O.D.'s which are coming due. Add them all together, and you get a national government

debt of 750 billion dollars. It is impossible for any human mind to conceive of such a figure, so let's put it this way. Suppose you had an income of \$8,000 a year. But instead of living within that income, you go into debt - borrow money for all sorts of things. You borrow so much that you now owe \$75,000 - on an \$8,000-income. The interest alone, on that debt, would eventually take nearly half your income. Of course, long before an individual got himself into a fix like this, he would probably go into bankruptcy. But this is exactly the fix the federal government is in - it owes 750 billion dollars on an 80-billion-dollar income. And this is one of the biggest threats we face - just as big as Khrushchev's rocket-rattling.

## THE EGG AND TAXES

Nothing would please the Soviets more than to see the rich, powerful - and free - United States spend itself into bankruptcy. When we have reduced ourselves to the mediocrity and government controls of Russia's slaves, the Reds will have won their battle against free, capitalist America without firing a

shot. We seem to be powerful and prosperous at the moment, and we are. But no society on earth can remain powerful and prosperous - and free - if it permits government to take always more and more of its substance.

Congressman Boggs of Louisiana recently made some studies of the tax-content of

America's

## FUTURE

Published every week by America's Future, Inc., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, New York. A non-profit, educational organization.

R. K. Scott . . . . . Publisher  
Rosalie M. Gordon . . . . . Editor  
John C. Wetzel . . . . . Business Manager

Subscription Price: \$5 per year, \$12 for three years. Ten week trial subscription \$1. Additional copies of specific issues: 1 copy for 15¢; 10 copies for \$1; 50 for \$4; 100 for \$6; 1,000 for \$30 - each price for bulk mailing to one person.

Second class mail privileges authorized at New Rochelle, New York.

individual items. We are more or less aware of the direct tax-grab on our incomes. But we hardly notice the taxes which are a part of the price we pay for everything we buy. For instance, Mr. Boggs found that when you buy a \$2500 automobile, nearly \$600 of that price goes for taxes. There are 116 different taxes on a man's suit. When you bought the egg you had for breakfast, the price you paid included 100 - yes, 100 - different taxes. When you pay the local property tax on your house, you may think you have taken care of its taxes. But actually there are 600 other taxes on your home. And here's another count against your wife's new hat. It has

150 taxes on it, even if you can't see them!

Of course, the poor taxpayer is told that all this is necessary because we must protect ourselves against the Red menace. No one in their right minds would say that we should not spend, and tax ourselves if need be, for the defense of the United States. But there are two points to bear in mind about this excuse for big spending. The first is that actual defense costs have not risen very much over the last few years. The greatest increase in government spending has been on things which have nothing to do with national defense - foreign and domestic handouts of all kinds. Practically all of these have to do with things which are no business of the federal government and, if I may mention such a notion, are in direct conflict with the American Constitution.

The other point is that even in the defense spending, great savings are possible without in any way hurting our defenses. In fact, some authorities believe they actually would be strengthened. I have mentioned before General Bonner Feller's contention that we are wasting money on so-called military

aid to foreign nations - nations on whom we cannot depend in case of war. This money could be spent much better on neglected areas of

defense here at home. In other words, we are spreading ourselves too thin - and in the process spending more for less real defense.

## **\$21 FOR A \$.25 ITEM**

In addition, there is the unconscionable waste in the defense program itself. When such things can go on in an area of government activity as important as national defense, you can imagine what happens in other government spending sprees. Incidentally this is an excellent practical reason for keeping the busy hand of the bureaucrat out of those areas of our lives in which they have no business. They not only use our own money to enslave us, but they do not even give us our money's worth. Here are a few examples of what happens to some of those tax-dollars you send to Washington to pay for the defense of America.

The government owns a 72-acre tract of land on Waikiki Beach in Hawaii. This is expensive resort property. It is worth 40 million dollars - of your money. But the Army won't sell it because it needs it for swimming and sunbathing for soldiers.

Near San Francisco there

are four military hospitals with more than 5,000 beds. Less than half of them are in use. But the Army and Navy want to tear two of them down. In order to save you some money? Oh, no - they want to build two new ones!

We have an Air Force base at a little town in West Germany. Four hundred men are stationed there. They needed some lockers. The lockers were ordered from a quartermaster in Philadelphia - 300 of them. Either he couldn't read or he felt especially generous with the taxpayers' money. So one fine day recently 30,000 lockers arrived at the little town in West Germany - 30,000 lockers for 400 men. The shipping cost alone, not counting the cost of the lockers, was \$100,000.

If you need a new socket for one of your lamps, you can go into a local store and buy it for \$.25. The bureaucrats in the Navy Department paid \$21 each for exactly the same socket.

The Army bureaucrats bought sets of wrenches. Of course, we want our soldiers to have the very best tools available. But this particular wrench-set can be bought in your local hardware store, at retail, for less than \$4.00. The Army paid \$29!

Various experts have estimated that anywhere from two to five billion dollars could

be cut out of the defense budget alone, if this sort of fantastic nonsense were stopped. And if it were, and if we cut out the giveaways and handouts, we could still have the best defense in the world - and at the same time begin to make a dent in that national debt which hangs over our heads like Damocles' sword.

- John T. Flynn

Foregoing items covered in Mutual network broadcast 7/17/60

\*\*\*\*\*

## LET THE READER BEWARE

In these columns last week, John T. Flynn called attention to the odd handling by the *N.Y. Times' Sunday Book Review* of Barry Goldwater's best-selling book *THE CONSCIENCE OF A CONSERVATIVE*. We would like to add an interesting addenda to that revealing story. It appears that the bias of the *Times* and its *Sunday Book Review* extends even to advertisements for books.

*Counterattack*, the anti-communist newsletter, points out that recently the *N. Y. Times* carried a two-column, full-page ad for a left-wing book club. The major item in the ad was a book by two characters with long pro-com-

munist records. In fact, both have been identified before congressional committees as part of the communist apparatus in America. Naturally, none of this appeared in the advertisement in the *Times*.

No one, of course, questions the right of the *N. Y. Times* to form its own policy on advertising. But seemingly it *does* have a policy, even though the mysteries of that policy are difficult to plumb. The *Times* does not accept any book-advertising that comes along - my goodness, no! It reserves the right to reject ads for reasons of desirability, responsibility and taste. Very commendable, is it not - thus to leave in the

reader's mind the notion that ads in the *Times* can be trusted? But where is the 'responsibility,' to say nothing of 'desirability' or 'taste' in not warning its readers, for instance, of the records of the above two authors?

That may seem a foolish question. How can a newspaper undertake to furnish background on all the ads it prints? The answer is that it cannot. Therefore it accepts all comers, as most great newspapers do, for which it has space, and eliminates only those which violate the laws of libel and the canons of good taste. But the *Times* evidently employs some sort of hanky-panky in the acceptance of book-advertising. With the above, and the following facts in mind, perhaps we can arrive at our own conclusions as to what the real standard of acceptance is.

Several years ago the N. Y. *Times Sunday Book Review* refused to run an ad for a book by Lee Mortimer called *Around the World Confidential*. The grounds for the refusal were reported to be 'taste.' Mr.

Mortimer's book was admittedly rather racy in parts. But it was also frankly anti-communist. The *Sunday Book Review* then and since has run not only ads, but reviews - often favorable reviews - of other books which make oldtime burlesque shows resemble a Sunday school picnic. And about the same time it refused an advertisement for Mr. Mortimer's book, it accepted and ran one for a book club headed by a former unrepentant Communist Party member.

This double standard of the *Times Sunday Book Review* extends even further. It has run innumerable ads, as well as reviews, for books extolling the virtues of Big Labor and its bosses. But not long ago it refused to accept an ad for (and never did deign to review) a book by an experienced newspaperman: E. L. Dayton's dispassionate, thoroughly documented - and non-sexy - biography of Walter Reuther.

Perhaps the N. Y. *Times* and its *Sunday Book Review* needs a new slogan. May we suggest: 'Let the Reader Beware?'

## IN THE NAME OF "DEFENSE"

"If you wanna buy a goat, try the army-navy outlet store near you. Twenty-four girl goats, bought by the Navy to chew

up the extensive underbrush surrounding its ordnance laboratory near Washington, are going material at the rate of two kids a year, while the ground cover is rapidly disappearing.

"If it isn't one surplus, it's another: anchors, hamburgers, oyster forks and now, goats!"

- Camden (S.C.) CHRONICLE

## UTTERLY FANTASTIC

*(The following is an excerpt from a statement issued by seven Protestant clergymen after the student riot against the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco.)*

"More than a dozen ministers were in attendance at the hearings on May 12 and 13 in the City Hall. What we witnessed was utterly fantastic. The shameful demonstration against law and order and against this duly constituted Committee of the Congress defies description. We sat in the rear of the room on a raised platform where we could easily observe the proceedings, right in the midst of the student demonstrators. We studied the crowd carefully for hours and could easily discern which were the masterminds of the mob riots. It is our certain conviction that this indefensible demonstration against law and order was conceived, planned, and directed by a few hard-core Communist agitators who were carrying out their textbook orders on insurrection with classic success. Leaders of the mob included faculty members and well-known

**AMERICA'S FUTURE, INC., 542 Main St., New Rochelle, N.Y.**

I understand you fill orders for books at regular list price, postage paid. Please mail me \_\_\_\_\_ copies of the book noted below. My check for \$\_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed ☐ Please bill me ☐.

Book I want is \_\_\_\_\_

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

leftist lawyers for fifth-amendment Communists...

"We watched a national committeeman for the Party, line up a dozen Communists near the railing and throw every sneer, invective, abusive language, vile profanity, and fiendish charge at the congressmen they could conceive. For nearly 15 minutes at one point, this lawless crowd of students from the University, together with Party cadres, had the chambers almost in their control...We witnessed more violations of the law in 15 minutes than we have seen in 15 years...

"We are at a loss to understand how clergymen, such as Bishop James Pike, could give aid and comfort to this lawless kind of activity by statements deriding the Committee, and by allowing his assistant pastor to address one of their despicable rallies."

---

AMERICA'S FUTURE, INC.  
542 Main St. New Rochelle N Y



